App F IX-4

P.

1931-32 (ME)

File No. 230-31

Serial Nos. 1, 10 & 12

Previous References

GB 214-25 (U-2)
ME 262 30 (12-14)

Later References

ME Tube-well 21 54)

RESERV

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 3

Part B for May 32

SUBJECT.

Re loan floated in Connection with the water-supply scheme to the Chintadripet Town

(Rs in interpellation of June 1932) by Mr D. Venkataramiah

Serial No	
1	Interpellation by Mr B Venkataramiah Chitaldrug, regarding the loans floated in connection with the water supply to the Chitaldrug town Submitted with a draft calling for information on all the points from the Comptroller for approval BS 30/5/32 2/5 AS Issue 1/5/32
10	Issue work memo dt 2/5/32 to comptr requesting him to furnish draft replies by the 9th inst J/Sec 2/5/32 5/5/32
12.	Letter No 3797/L.S. dt 7.5.32 from the Comptroller to Govt: furnishing replies to the Interpellation by Mr B. Venkataramiah of Chitaldrug, viz: the loan floated in connection with the Water Supply scheme to the Chitaldrug Town The replies suggested seem suitable and may perhaps be adopted 24/5 Some observations are suggested in pencil (Pencilled) BS 10/5/32 11/5 II Member 13/5 SM 14/5 I further revised SM 14/5 HM 16/5 HM 16/5

TYPING SECTION 16 MAY 1932 SECTT
GENERAL SECRETARY 11 MAY 1932 No 26
OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL 14 MAY 1932 No 4/6/26
Note Contn Sheet
Typing Section

WD 70—GBPV4—60 000—13-8-31.

No of 193

Four copies of interpellation with revised replies are submitted for kind perusal before transmission to the R. A. Section.

24
19/5/32

or

3 Copies taken & file returned

20/5/32 20/5/32

B
157-6

Ms. 230 - 31 — 1

4238

20 APR 1932

L.B. BRANCH.

FORM II

Memorandum of Interpellations proposed for reply in the BUDGET

Session of the Representative Assembly of the Chittaldrug District.

For the BUDGET Session of JUNE 1932

Subject 1.

Loans floated in connection with the water supply to the Chitaldrug town.

No 1.

Name of Member

Mr. B Venkataramiah Chitaldrug.

SS 2914

Interpellation

Will the Government be pleased to state:-

1. Whether it is a fact that in connection with the water supply scheme in 1916-17 two loans were floated and a sum of Rs 1,49305 was collected and the interest at 6% was paid from 1919 to 1932-33 investing the amount in the Government Savings bank at 5% and taking 1 per cent from the Municipality for payment of interest to the bond holders

2. It is not a fact that Government subsequently passed orders stating that only ¼ per cent would be recovered from the Municipality the remaining ¾ per cent being paid by Government.

Have not the Municipality urged for the refund of Rs 14480-14-11 recovered from them in excess at ¾ per cent between the years 1919 and 1932-33. How has this matter been disposed of?

3. Is it a fact that Government have since invested the amount at 6% If is it not unnecessary to recover the ¾ per cent from the Municipality? When the matter stands thus why is the Comptroller to Government urging again for the recovery of interest at 1% from the Municipality?

4. Will the Government be pleased to instruct the Comptroller to Government to refund Rs 14480-14-11 to the Municipality previously recovered from them in excess at ¾ per cent during the period 1919 to 1932-33.

WD 01373—GPB—3,000—30-4-30

Appendix F ~~G—17~~

SUBJECT

Section ml

File No 230-31

Serial No 10

Diary No of letter replied to L 4238

No L 4400/Gne

To. The Accountant to the Govt of Mysore E

General and Revenue Secretariat

(ml)

the *193*

Sir

Date of issue 2-5-32

I am directed to forward herewith copy of interpellation no. 4 of proposed for being answered at the ensuing Session quest of June 1932, by Mr B Venkatramiah Chitaldrug, re the loans floated in connection with the water supply to the Chitaldrug town and to request you to be good enough to furnish ~~final~~ first replies on all the points ~~noted~~ by the 7th inst

Signed by Mr RS Rao

List of enclosures

I have etc

Copied by

Examined by

For General Secretary

WD 71—GPBM—40 000—20 7-31

Budget Session of June 1932

Ml 230-31-12 4407

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

No 3791/S.L. /Encl.1.

Comptroller's Office, Bangalore,

Dated the 7th May *1932*

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
7 MAY 1932
No. S 9

To

The General Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith draft replies to the interpellation sent with your letter No.L7400/Ml.230-31 dated 2-5-1932.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller.

S.S. Submitted for kind personal & orders 21/5/32

Budget Session of June 1932

Interpellation by
Mr. B. Venkataramiah, Chitaldrug.

Replies.

--- Subject.- Loans floated in connection with the Water-supply to Chitaldrug Town ---

Will the Government be pleased to state:-

1. Whether it is a fact that in connection with the water supply scheme in 1916-17 two loans were floated and a sum of Rs.1,40,995, was collected and the interest at 6% was paid from 1919 to 1922-23 investing the amount in the Government Savings Bank at 5% and taking 1 per cent from the Municipality for payment of interest to the bond holders.

1. Yes. The amount collected under the loans was 1,40,995.

(ii) Yes.

2. It is not a fact that Government subsequently passed orders stating that only ¼ per cent would be recovered from the Municipality, the remaining ¾ per cent being paid by Government.

Have not the Municipality urged for the refund of Rs.14,486-14-11 recovered from them in excess at ¾ per cent between the years 1919 and 1922-23. How has this matter been disposed of?

No-

2. (i) It is not a fact. No such orders as regards the apportionment of interest have been issued by Government.

(ii) The sum of Rs.14,486-14-11 mentioned by the member is not ¾th per cent excess recovery as stated by him. It is the difference between the total amount paid by the Municipality towards interest, and that received by them from Government and which is to be charged to the capital account. The Municipality have been urging for the refund of this sum. This amount was ordered in G.O.No. Fl.464/G.F.214-25-2 dated 26-7-1926 to be made over to the Municipality after the work on the project was commenced by debiting the capital estimate. The work was not undertaken at all and the 2nd series of the loan is also to be discharged in July next. A final account will be made in consultation with the President of the Municipality and necessary adjustments made after fixing the portion of the liability to be finally borne by the Municipality.

3. Is it a fact that Government have since invested the amount at 6%, If so is it not unnecessary to recover the ¼ per cent from the Municipality? When the matter stands thus, why is the Comptroller to Government urging again for the recovery of interest at 1% from the Municipality?

3. It is not a fact that Government have invested the amount at 6%. The other questions do not arise.

(i) no

(ii) & (iii) Vide Bond issue

4. Will the Government be pleased to instruct the Comptroller to Government to refund Rs.14,486-14-11 to the Municipality previously recovered from them in excess at ¾ per cent during the period 1919 to 1923.

(4) Please see remarks against (2) above

S.S.

for Comptroller.

BUDGET SESSION OF JUNE 1932.

INTERPELLATION BY

Mr. B. Venkataramiah, Chitaldrug.

Subject:- Loan floated in connection with the Water-supply to Chitaldrug Town.

Interpellation.	Replies.
Will the Government be pleased to state:-	
1. Whether it is a fact that in connection with the water supply scheme in 1916-17 two loans were floated and a sum of Rs.1,40,995 was collected and the interest at 6% was paid from 1919 to 1922-23 investing the amount in the Government Savings Bank at 5% and taking 1 per cent from the Municipality for payment of interest to the bond holders.	1. Yes.
2(i) It is not a fact that Government subsequently passed orders stating that only 1/4 per cent would be recovered from the Municipality, the remaining ¾ per cent being paid by Government.	2. (i) No.
(ii) Have not the Municipality urged for the refund of Rs.14,486-14-11 recovered from them in excess at ¾ per cent between the years 1919 and 1922-23. How has this matter been disposed of?	(ii) The sum of Rs.14,486-14-11 as mentioned by the member is not ¾ per cent excess recovery as stated by him. It is the difference between the total amount paid by the Municipality towards interest to debenture holders and that received by them from Government which is to be charged to the capital account. The Municipality have been urging for the refund of this sum. This amount was ordered in G.O. No.Fl.464/G.F.214-25-2 dated 26-7-1926 to be made over to the Municipality after the work on the project was commenced by debiting the capital estimate. The work was not undertaken at all. It is not a fact that Government have invested the amount at 6%. The other question do not arise.
3. Is it a fact that Government (i) have since invested the amount at 6%. If so is it not unnecessary to recover the ¾ per cent from the Municipality? (iii) When the matter stands thus, why is the Comptroller to Government urging again for the recovery of interest at 1% from the Municipality?	3. (i) No. (ii) and (iii) These does not arise
4. Will the Government be pleased to instruct the Comptroller to Government to refund Rs.14,486-14-11 to the Municipality previously recovered from them in excess at ¾ per cent during the period 1919 to 1923.	4. Please see answers to 2(ii) above

A. Subba Rao

For General Secretary to Govt